



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

American friends wish to join this party, they should send word by the 21st inst. to H. S. Perris, 167 St. Stephen's House, Westminster, London, S. W. Some day perhaps the friends of peace may be able to arrange for a cruise of sixteen great peace ships around the world, the trip to last a year and to include a series of great meetings held in all the important port cities of the world.

The quarterly report for June of the Council of Direction of the American Branch of the Association for International Conciliation shows that since the last report the Council has published and distributed the following documents: "America and the New Diplomacy," by James Brown Scott (March); "The Delusion of Militarism," by Charles E. Jefferson (April); "Address by Hon. Elihu Root" (May); "The United States and China," by Wei-Ching W. Yen (June). The Association has also much extended its mailing list by the addition of the names of members of some twenty different societies.

The National Peace Council of Great Britain, a committee consisting of representatives of all the important peace and arbitration organizations of the United Kingdom, seventeen in number, has removed to new offices at 167 St. Stephen's House, Victoria Embankment, Westminster, S. W., London. This is an excellent situation, being only one minute's walk from the Parliament Houses. The Council has recently published the Report of the London Peace Congress of last summer, and is ready to supply copies at five shillings (\$1.25) net. The postage is twenty cents extra. It is a fine volume of four hundred and eighty octavo pages, handsomely illustrated with portraits. Copies may also be procured of the American Peace Society.

The annual meeting of the Berne Peace Bureau will be held at Stockholm, Sweden, on the 30th of August, at 2.30 P. M., in one of the halls of the Palace of the Nobility, in which the eighteenth International Peace Congress will be held. The annual meeting will be preceded by a meeting, at 2 o'clock, of the Commission, or Standing Committee, of the Bureau.

An association calling itself "The Peace Mothers of the World" was organized at Olalla, Wash., on Sunday, May 30. The President is Olivia F. Shepard, the Secretary-Treasurer, Mrs. J. L. Green, and the Vice-President, Emma E. Rader. We presume that this association either is or soon will be affiliated with the State of Washington Peace Society recently organized at Seattle as a Branch of the American Peace Society.

Miss Anna B. Eckstein, a member of the Board of Directors of the American Peace Society, is for the present giving her whole time to the work of the World-Petition to the third Hague Conference in behalf of a general treaty of obligatory arbitration. She writes from Toronto that "the World-Petition is going forward with big strides." Several millions of persons have already approved the petition. Miss Eckstein sailed for Europe on the steamer "George Washington" on July 1. She will visit her relatives in Germany, promote the further signing of the petition in Europe and attend the Stockholm International Peace Congress.

The second National Congress of the German Peace Societies was held at Stuttgart May 14 to 16. It was

participated in by nearly all the leading German peace workers, Baron de Neufville, Dr. Quidde, Mr. Fried, Dr. Umfrid, and many others. The questions discussed included Franco-German reconciliation, the observance of the 18th of May, treaties of obligatory arbitration, the teaching of history in the schools, the exchange of students between different countries, world organization, limitation of armaments, etc., all of which were treated in the most advanced spirit.

Fredrik Bajer of Copenhagen, leader of the peace movement in Denmark, recipient of half the Nobel Peace Prize last December, gave his Nobel lecture at Christiania on May 18. The Hall of the Nobel Institute, where he spoke, was filled with a choice audience, the King and several members of the Government being present. His subject was, "The Organization of the Peace Movement."

Brevities.

. . . The report that China has withdrawn her request that the Hsinminton-Fakumen railroad controversy with Japan be submitted to the Hague Court has been denied by the Japanese legation at Pekin. China holds, it is said, that the way is still open for carrying the case to The Hague.

. . . Negotiations regarding the regulation and administration of the Russian railroad zone in Manchuria have been begun at Pekin by Mr. Korotovitz, the Russian minister, and the Chinese Foreign Board.

. . . The city of Cleveland, Ohio, is this year to add new laurels to itself. It is to have a sensible Fourth of July — without cannon, guns or firecrackers. The great fire last summer caused by an explosion of fireworks has made the people unwilling to see such a catastrophe repeated, and they are reported to be heartily supporting the city government in its plan to have a really worthy celebration of Independence Day. It is amazing that our barbarous and senseless method of keeping this day has been allowed to go on so long. Every city in the nation ought to follow Cleveland's example.

. . . At a meeting of the Directors of the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce on June 10, Mr. Mahlon N. Kline of the Committee on Arbitration, who represented the Chamber at the Mohonk Arbitration Conference in May, made an extended report of the Mohonk meeting, which covers eight pages of the printed minutes. It includes the Mohonk platform and a considerable portion of Dr. Butler's opening address, which will thus come to the knowledge of thousands of Philadelphia business men.

The Present Anglo-German Situation.

BY NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER, PRESIDENT OF
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

Opening Address as Presiding Officer at the Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration, May 19, 1909.

Two years ago, when I last had the honor of addressing this Conference as its presiding officer, we were all looking forward with confidence and high anticipation to the second Hague Conference, then soon to assemble. We were much concerned with the program of business to be laid before that Conference, and with the forms of

agreement or declaration which we hoped would there be decided upon. In particular, emphasis was laid upon the desire, widely entertained by right thinking men, that the second Hague Conference should take the steps necessary to build up a truly judicial international tribunal, by the side of, or in succession to, the semi-diplomatic tribunal which had been the fruit of the first Conference at The Hague; and that the Conference should, itself, provide for its reassembling at stated intervals thereafter, without waiting for the specific call or invitation of any monarch or national executive. The history of the second Hague Conference is still fresh in our minds. Although not everything was done that we had hoped for, yet, when the cloud of discussion lifted, we could plainly see that long steps in advance had been taken, and that there was coming to be a more fundamental and far-reaching agreement among the nations as to what was wise and practicable in the steady substitution of the rule of justice for the rule of force among men.

To-day, however, the most optimistic observer of the movement of public opinion in the world, and the most stoutly convinced advocate of international justice, must confess himself perplexed, if not amazed, by some of the striking phenomena which meet his view. Expenditure for naval armaments is everywhere growing by leaps and bounds.

Edmund Burke said that he did not know the method of drawing up an indictment against a whole people; but perhaps it may be easier to detect some of the signs of emotional insanity than to draw an indictment for crime. The storm centre of the world's weather to-day is to be found in the condition of mind of a large portion of the English people. The nation which, for generations, has contributed so powerfully to the world's progress in all that relates to the spread of the rule of law, to the peaceful development of commerce and industry, to the advancement of letters and science, and to the spread of humanitarian ideas, appears to be possessed for the moment—it can only be for the moment—with the evil spirit of militarism. It is hard to reconcile the excited and exaggerated utterances of responsible statesmen in Parliament and on the platform; the loud beating of drums and the sounding of alarms in the public press, even in that portion of it most given to sobriety of judgment; and the flocking of the populace to view a tawdry and highly sensational drama of less than third-rate importance for the sake of its contribution to their mental obsession by hobgoblins and the ghosts of national enemies and invaders, with the traditional temperament of a nation that has acclaimed the work of Howard, Wilberforce and Shaftesbury, whose public life was so long dominated by the lofty personality of William Ewart Gladstone, and of which the real heroes to-day are the John Milton and the Charles Darwin whose anniversaries are just now celebrated with so much sincerity and genuine appreciation.

What has happened? If an opinion may be ventured by an observer whose friendliness amounts to real affection, and who is in high degree jealous of the repute of the English people and of their place in the van of the world's civilization, it is that this lamentable outburst is attendant upon a readjustment of relative position and importance among the nations of the earth, due to economic and intellectual causes, which readjustment is in-

terpreted in England, unconsciously of course, in terms of the politics of the first Napoleon rather than in terms of the politics of the industrial and intelligent democracies of the twentieth century. Germany is steadily gaining in importance in the world, and England is in turn losing some of her long-standing relative primacy. The causes are easy to discover, and are in no just sense provocative of war or strife. Indeed, it is highly probable that war, if it should come with all its awful consequences, would only hasten the change it was entered upon to prevent.

It must not be forgotten that while there has long existed in Europe a German people, yet the German nation as such is a creation of very recent date. With the substantial completion of German political unity after the Franco-Prussian war, there began an internal development in Germany even more significant and more far-reaching in its effects than that which was called into existence by the trumpet voice of Fichte, after the disastrous defeat of the Prussian army by Napoleon at Jena, and guided by the hands of Stein and Hardenberg. This later development has been fundamentally economic and educational in character, and has been directed with great skill toward the development of the nation's foreign commerce, the husbanding of its own natural resources, and the comfort and health of the masses of its rapidly growing population.

Within a short generation the pressure of German competition has been severely felt in the trade and commerce of every part of the world. The two most splendid fleets engaged in the Atlantic carrying trade fly the German flag. Along either coast of South America, in the waters of China and Japan, in the ports of the Mediterranean and on the trade routes to India and Australia, the German flag has become almost as familiar as the English. The intensive application of the discoveries of theoretical science to industrial processes has made Germany, in a sense, the world's chief teacher in its great international school of industry and commerce. With this over-sea trade expansion has gone the building of a German navy. It appears to be the building of this navy which has so excited many of the English people. For the moment we are not treated to the well-worn paradox that the larger a nation's navy the less likely it is to be used in combat and the more certain is the peace of the world. The old Adam asserts himself long enough to complain, in this case at least, that if a navy is building in Germany it must be intended for offensive use; and against whom could the Germans possibly intend to use a navy except against England? Their neighbors, the French and the Russians, they could readily, and with less risk, overrun with their great army. The United States is too far away to enter into the problem as a factor of any real importance. Therefore, the inference is drawn that the navy must be intended for an attack upon England. It is worth while noting that, on this theory, the German navy now building appears to be the first of modern navies intended for military uses. It alone of all the world's navies, however large, however costly, is not a messenger of peace!

One must needs ask, then, what reason is to be found in the nature of the German people, in the declarations of their responsible rulers, or in the political relations between Germany and any other nation, for the belief that

the German navy alone, among all modern navies, is building for a warlike purpose? Those of us who feel that the business of navy-building is being greatly overdone, and that it cannot for a moment be reconciled with sound public policy, or with the increasingly insistent demand for social improvements and reforms, may well wish that the German naval program were much more restricted than it is. But, waiving that point for the moment, what ground is there for the suspicion which is so widespread in England against Germany, and for the imputation to Germany of evil intentions toward England? Speaking for myself, and making full use of such opportunities for accurate information as I have had, I say with the utmost emphasis, and with entire sincerity, that I do not believe there is any ground whatever for those suspicions or for those imputations. Nor, what is much more important, has adequate ground for those suspicions and imputations been given by any responsible person.

Are we to believe, for example, that the whole public life in both Germany and England is part of an opera bouffe, and that all the public declarations of responsible leaders of opinion are meaningless or untrue? Are the increasingly numerous international visits of municipal officials, of clergymen, of teachers, of trades unionists, of newspaper men, as well as the cordial and intimate reception given them by their hosts, all a sham and a pretense? Have all these men daggers in their hands and subtle poisons in their pockets? Are we to assume that there is no truth or frankness or decency left in the world? Are nations in the twentieth century, and nations that represent the most in modern civilization at that, so lost to shame that they fall upon each other's necks and grasp each other's hands and swear eternal fealty as conditions precedent to making an unannounced attack upon each other during a fog? Even the public morality of the sixteenth century would have revolted at that. The whole idea is too preposterous for words, and it is the duty of the thoughtful and sincere friends of the English people, in this country and in every country, to use every effort to bring them to see the unreasonableness, to use no stronger term, of the attitude toward Germany which they are at present made to assume.

But, says the objector, England is an island nation. Unless she commands the sea absolutely her national existence is in danger; any strong navy in hands that may become unfriendly threatens her safety. Therefore she is justified in being suspicious of any nation that builds a big navy. That formula has been repeated so often that almost everybody believes it. There was a time when it was probably and within limits true. One cannot but wonder, however, whether it is true any longer. In the first place, national existence does not now depend upon military and naval force. Italy is safe; so are Holland and Portugal, Mexico and Canada. Then, the possibilities of aerial navigation alone, with the resulting power of attacking a population or a fleet huddled beneath a cloud of monsters traveling through the air and willing to risk their own existence and the lives of their occupants for the opportunity to approach near enough to enable a vital injury to be inflicted upon another people, to say nothing of the enginery of electricity, have changed the significance of the word

island. Although an island remains, as heretofore, a body of land entirely surrounded by water, yet that surrounding water is no longer to be the only avenue of approach to it, its possessions and its inhabitants. Even if we speak in the most approved language of militarism itself, it is apparent that a fleet a mile wide will not long protect England from attack or invasion, or from starvation, if the attacking or invading party is in command of the full resources of modern science and modern industry. But if justice be substituted for force, England will always be safe; her achievements for the past thousand years have made that certain.

The greatest present obstacle to the limitation of the armaments under the weight of which the world is staggering toward bankruptcy, the greatest obstacle to carrying forward those social and economic reforms for which every nation is crying out, that its population may be better housed, the public health more completely protected, and the burden of unemployment lifted from the backs of the wage-earning classes, appears to many to be the insistence by England on what it calls the two-power naval standard. So long as the British Empire circles the globe, and so long as its ships and its goods are to be found in every port, the British navy will, by common consent, be expected to be much larger and more powerful than that of any other nation. Neither in France nor in Germany nor in Japan nor in America would that proposition be disputed. Even the two-power standard might not bring poverty and distress and wasteful expenditure to other nations if naval armaments were limited by agreement or were diminishing in strength. But, insisted upon in an era of rapidly increasing armaments, in this day of Dreadnaughts, the two-power standard leads, and must inevitably lead, to huge programs of naval construction in every nation where the patriotism and good sense of the people do not put a stop to this modern form of madness. The practical sense of the world is against it; only so-called expert theories are on its side.

Under the prodding of alarmists in Parliament and the press, a Liberal ministry has been compelled to say that it would propose and support measures for naval aggrandizement and expenditure based upon the principle that the fighting strength of the British navy must be kept always one-tenth greater than the sum total of the fighting strength of the two next most powerful navies in the world. At first it was even proposed to include the navy of the United States in making this computation. Later that position was fortunately retreated from. But it will be observed that in computing the so-called two-power standard, the English jingoes count as contingent enemies the French and the Japanese, with both of whom their nation is in closest alliance, and also the Russians, with whom the English are now on terms of cordial friendship. In other words, unless all such treaties of alliance and comity are a fraud and a sham, these nations at least should be omitted from the reckoning. This would leave no important navy save that of Germany to be counted in possible opposition. For this reason, it is just now alike the interest and the highest opportunity for service of America and of the world to bring about the substitution of cordial friendship between England and Germany for the suspicion and distrust which so widely prevail. When this is

done, a long step toward an international agreement for the limitation of armaments will have been taken; new progress can then be made in the organization of the world on those very principles for which the English themselves have time-long stood, and for whose development and application they have made such stupendous sacrifices and performed such herculean service.

If America were substituted for England, it would be difficult to see how any responsible statesman who had read the majority and minority reports recently laid before Parliament by the Poor Law Commission, could for one moment turn aside from the stern duty of national protection against economic, educational and social evils at home, to follow the will-o'-the-wisp of national protection against a non-existent foreign enemy. England to-day, in her own interest, needs to know Germany better; to learn from Germany, to study with care her schools and universities, her system of workingman's insurance, of old age pensions, of accident insurance, of sanitary and tenement house inspection and reform, and all her other great social undertakings, rather than to spend time and energy and an impoverished people's money in the vain task of preparing, by monumental expenditure and waste, to meet a condition of international enmity which has only an imaginary existence. It is the plain duty of the friends of both England and Germany—and what right-minded man is not the warm friend and admirer of both these splendid peoples—to exert every possible influence to promote a better understanding of each of these peoples by the other, a fuller appreciation of the services of each to modern civilization, and to point out the folly, not to speak of the wickedness, of permitting the seeds of discord to be sown between them by any element in the population of either.

I like to think that the real England and the real Germany found voice on the occasion of a charming incident which it was my privilege to witness in September of last year. At the close of the impressive meeting of the Interparliamentary Union, held in Berlin, the German Imperial Chancellor offered the gracious and bountiful hospitality of his official residence to the hundreds of representatives of foreign parliamentary bodies then gathered in the German capital. Standing under the spreading trees of his own great gardens, surrounded by the leaders of German scholarship and of German political thought, Prince von Bülow was approached by more than two score members of the British Parliament, with Lord Weardale at their head. In a few impressive, eloquent and low-spoken sentences Lord Weardale expressed to the Chancellor what he believed to be the real feeling of England toward Germany, and what he felt should be the real relationship to exist between the two governments and the two peoples. In words equally cordial and quite as eloquent, Prince von Bülow responded to Lord Weardale with complete sympathy and without reserve. The incident made a deep impression upon the small group who witnessed it. It was over in a few minutes. It received no record in the public press, but in my memory it remains as a weighty, and I hope as a final, refutation of the widespread impression that England and Germany are at bottom hostile, and are drifting inevitably toward the maelstrom of an armed conflict. What could more surely lead to conviction of high crimes and misde-

meanors at the bar of history than for two culture-peoples, with political and intellectual traditions in their entirety unequaled in the world's history, in this twentieth century to tear each other to pieces like infuriated gladiators in a bloody arena? The very thought is revolting, and the mere suggestion of it ought to dismay the civilized world.

The aim of all rational and practicable activity for the permanent establishment of the world's peace and for the promotion of justice is and must always be the education of the world's public opinion. Governments, however popular and however powerful, have ceased to dominate; everywhere public opinion dominates governments. As never before, public opinion is concerning itself with the solution of grave economic and social questions which must be solved aright if the great masses of the world's population are to share comfort and happiness. A nation's credit means the general belief in its ability to pay in the future. That nation which persistently turns away from the consideration of those economic and social questions upon which the productive power of its population must in last resort depend, limits and eventually destroys its own credit. That nation which insists, in response to cries more or less inarticulate and to formulas more or less outworn, upon spending the treasure taken from its population in taxes upon useless and wasteful armaments, hastens its day of doom, for it impairs its credit or ultimate borrowing capacity in a double way. It not only expends unproductively and wastefully vast sums of the nation's taxes, but it substitutes this unproductive and wasteful expenditure for an expenditure of equal amount, which might well be both productive and uplifting. The alternative to press upon the attention of mankind is that of huge armaments or social and economic improvement. The world cannot have both. There is a limit to man's capacity to yield up taxes for public use. Economic consumption is now heavily taxed everywhere. Accumulated wealth is being sought out in its hiding places, and is constantly being loaded with a heavier burden. All this cannot go on forever. The world must choose between pinning its faith to the symbols of a splendid barbarism and devoting its energies to the tasks of an enlightened civilization.

Despite everything, the political organization of the world in the interest of peace and justice proceeds apace. The movement is as sure as that of an Alpine glacier, and it has now become much more easily perceptible.

There is to be established at The Hague beyond any question, either by the next Hague Conference or before it convenes by the leading nations of the world, acting along the lines of the principles adopted at the second Hague Conference two years ago, a high court of international justice. It is as clearly indicated as anything can be that that court is to become the supreme court of the nations of the world.

The Interparliamentary Union, which has within a few weeks adopted a permanent form of organization, and chosen a permanent secretary, whose headquarters are to be in the Peace Palace at The Hague itself,—an occurrence of the greatest public importance, which has, to my knowledge, received absolutely no mention in the press,—now attracts to its membership representatives of almost every parliamentary body in existence. At

the last meeting of the Interparliamentary Union, held in Berlin, the Parliament of Japan, the Russian Duma, and the newly-organized Turkish Parliament, were all represented. By their side sat impressive delegations from the Parliaments of England, of France, of Germany, of Austria-Hungary, of Italy, of Belgium, of The Netherlands and of the Scandinavian nations, as well as eight or ten representatives of the American Congress. In this Interparliamentary Union, which has now passed through its preliminary or experimental stage, lies the germ of a coming federation of the world's legislatures which will be established in the near future, and whose powers and functions, if not precisely defined at first, will grow naturally from consultative to that authority of which wisdom and justice can never be divested. Each year that the representatives of a national parliament sit side by side with the representatives of the parliaments of other nations, look their colleagues in the face and discuss with them freely and frankly important matters of international concern, it will become more difficult for them to go back and vote a declaration of war against the men from whose consultation room they have but just come. Among honest men familiarity breeds confidence, not contempt.

Where, then, in this coming political organization of the world, is the international executive power to be found? Granting that we have at The Hague an international court; granting that we have sitting, now at one national capital and now at another, what may be called a consultative international parliament, in what direction is the executive authority to be looked for? The answer to this vitally important question has been indicated by no less an authority than Senator Root, in his address before the American Society of International Law, more than a year ago. Mr. Root then referred to the fact that because there is an apparent absence of sanction for the enforcement of the rules of international law, great authorities have denied that those rules are entitled to be classed as law at all. He pointed out that this apparent inability to execute in the field of international politics a rule agreed upon as law, seems to many minds to render quite futile the further discussion of the political organization of the world. Mr. Root, however, had too practical as well as too profound a mind to rest content with any such lame and impotent conclusion. He went on to show, as he readily could, that nations day by day yield to arguments which have no compulsion behind them, and that as a result of such argument they are constantly changing policies, modifying conduct and offering redress for injuries. Why is this? Because, as Mr. Root pointed out, the public opinion of the world is the true international executive. No law, not even municipal law, can long be effective without a supporting public opinion. It may take its place upon the statute book, all constitutional and legislative requirements having been carefully complied with; yet it may and does remain a dead letter unless public opinion cares enough about it, believes enough in it, to vitalize it and to make it real.

In this same direction lies the highest hope of civilization. What the world's public opinion demands of nations or of international conferences, it will get. What the world's public opinion is determined to enforce, will be enforced. The occasional brawler and disturber of

the peace in international life will one day be treated as is the occasional brawler and disturber of the peace in the streets of a great city. The aim of this Conference, and of every gathering of like character, must insistently and persistently be the education of the public opinion of the civilized world.

The world is being politically organized while we are talking about it, and wondering how it is to be done and when it is to come to pass. Little by little the steps are taken, now in the formulation of a treaty, now in the instructions given to representatives at an international conference, now in the new state of mind brought about by the participation in international gatherings and the closer study of international problems, until one day the world will be surprised to find how far it has traveled by these successive short steps. We need not look for any great revolutionary or evolutionary movement that will come suddenly. A revolutionary movement would not be desirable, and evolutionary movements do not come in that way. Slowly here a little, there a little, line upon line, and precept upon precept, will the high ethical and political ideals of civilized man assert themselves and take on such forms as may be necessary to their fullest accomplishment.

We Americans have a peculiar responsibility toward the political organization of the world. Whether we recognize it or not, we are universally looked to, if not to lead in this undertaking, at least to contribute powerfully toward it. Our professions and our principles are in accord with the highest hopes of mankind. We owe it to ourselves, to our reputation and to our influence, that we do not by our conduct belie those principles and those professions; that we do not permit selfish interests to stir up among us international strife and ill-feeling; that we do not permit the noisy boisterousness of irresponsible youth, however old in years or however high in place, to lead us into extravagant expenditure for armies and navies; and that, most of all, we shall cultivate at home and in our every relation, national and international, that spirit of justice which we urge so valiantly upon others. *Si vis pacem, para pacem!*

The Prince of Peace.

BY REV. CHARLES R. BROWN.

Baccalaureate Address delivered at the University of California, Berkeley, Cal., May 9, 1909.

In my selection of a theme I have ventured to break away from the conventional style of baccalaureate address. I bring you to-day no word of counsel touching those moral values which are altogether private and personal. I would undertake rather to direct your minds to the consideration of a certain problem, vast and grave, whose scope is national and international.

We live in a land governed by public opinion. The seat of authority is not at Washington—the seat of authority is to be found in those prevailing sentiments and convictions which determine the real attitude of the people themselves. As college-trained men and women, you are called to be leaders in the great work of forming that body of public opinion. Where it is wise, honest, resolute, it becomes the final source of safety for any republic. It is of vital importance, then, that your contribution to that section of public opinion which bears